

REMARKS

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant selects Group I (claims 1-10) with traverse.

The requirement has been justified on the grounds that the product as claimed could be made by another and materially different process, namely by etching as opposed to forming a mixture of predetermined shape. This justification is clearly not valid since claim 11 does not call for the step of forming. Moreover, how it is possible to realize a body having two types of particles by etching is not apparent.

The requirement has also been justified on the grounds that the two groups have a separate status as shown by a different search classification. It is respectfully submitted that when the entire searches to be conducted are set forth, the search classification will be the same.

Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Acknowledgement of the IDS filed with the original application papers in the next communication from the PTO is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/810,643
Amendment dated
Reply to Office Action of November 29, 2005

Docket No.: M1071.1901

The early further consideration of the pending application is respectfully
requested.

Dated: December 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Edward A. Meilman

Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant